DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 158 799 95 JC 780 456

AUTHOR Sanchez, Bonnie M., Comp.
TITLE About Staff Evaluation: A Brief Highlighting Important Literature Since 1966 on Community College Staff Evaluation.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Los Angeles. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Coll. Information.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Aug 78
NOTE 23p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Personnel; *Administrator Evaluation; *Annotated Bibliographies; College Faculty; Community Colleges; *Evaluation Methods; *Faculty Evaluation; *Junior Colleges; Part Time Teachers; *Personnel Evaluation; Presidents; Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance
IDENTIFIERS Information Analysis Products

ABSTRACT

This brief focuses on staff evaluation in the community college. An introductory section reviews the major concerns presented in the literature relative to implementing evaluation programs; determining specific objectives; rating scales for administrator evaluation; a four-step program for appraising a college president's performance; evaluation methods; inservice training for faculty; student evaluation of faculty performance; and the correlation between satisfaction with teaching, community educational support, and total job satisfaction with student rating of teaching effectiveness. In addition, the problems not treated in the literature are cited. Following this, an annotated bibliography of both published and unpublished materials from the ERIC system files is organized into six sections: an overview of staff evaluation (5 items), evaluation of administrators (6), faculty evaluation (12), evaluation of part-time faculty (3), student evaluation of faculty (7), and evaluation of non-instructional personnel (4). (TR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ERIC

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES

ED158799

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ABOUT STAFF EVALUATION

A Brief highlighting important literature since 1966 on community college staff evaluation.

Compiled by

Bonnie M. Sanchez

96 Powell Library Building
University of California
Los Angeles 90024

JC 780456

August 1978

This Brief focuses on staff evaluation in the community college. It consists of six sections: Overview of Staff Evaluation; Evaluation of Administrators; Faculty Evaluation; Evaluation of Part-Time Faculty; Student Evaluation of Faculty; and Evaluation of Non-Instructional Personnel. This literature review is based on references to both published and unpublished materials from the files of the ERIC system. Bracketed publication dates are approximate.

Complete copies of the titles with asterisks may be purchased from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210. The microfiche price for each title cited here is $0.83. Hard copy (xerox reproduction) prices are: 1-25 pages, $1.67; 26-50, $2.06; 51-75, $3.50; 76-100, $4.67. For materials having more than 100 pages, add $1.34 for each 25-page increment (or fraction thereof). Postage must be added to all orders.

Based on the studies abstracted here, THE LITERATURE TELLS US THAT:

A consensus exists among a number of community college administrators and faculty that lack of administrative and faculty time is the major problem in implementing faculty evaluation programs.

Determining specific learning objectives provides both a measure of student accountability and a measure of faculty evaluation.

A total evaluation package--which includes evaluations by students and supervisors and evaluation of non-instructional activities as well as individual professional development plans specifying exact goals--has been adopted at one southeastern college.

Administrator evaluation may best be achieved if each administrator develops a set of short- and long-range objectives with the means of attaining these objectives.

Rating scales for administrator evaluation might well include job related evaluation procedures, community related activities, publications and presentations, and professional development activities.

A four-step program for appraising the performance of college presidents in one large, multi-campus district includes an agreement between the president and chancellor regarding the job content and major duties, definition of goals for each responsibility, agreement on criteria for the president's progress, and a review of efforts to meet previously established goals.

Evaluation of faculty may still be looked on unfavorably by faculty if the system used for their evaluation is unpopular.

Presidential evaluation provides institutions with opportunities to carefully delineate roles, responsibilities, and expectations of their chief executive officers.

About three-fourths of all community colleges in the nation claim to have a formal faculty evaluation program.

There are essentially three methods used for evaluating community college instructors: determining teacher characteristics, assessing performance, and measuring student outcomes.

Some college districts recommend that district subsidized inservice training should be required for all faculty every three or four years.

To what extent philosophical conflicts between evaluation purposes and methods impede the effectiveness of evaluation procedures.

End-of-course ratings can be generally reliable indicators of students reactions, but a more accurate assessment of the dynamics of teaching-learning situations requires the input of teacher/student expectations.

A statistically significant relationship was found at one college between measures of satisfaction with teaching, community educational support, and total job satisfaction with student ratings of teaching effectiveness.

Twenty-eight studies, involving over 70,000 student ratings of faculty in over 50 colleges and universities, were conducted and published between 1954 and 1974.

THE LITERATURE DOES NOT TELL US:

If given sufficient time on the part of administrators and faculty, effective faculty evaluation procedures will be instituted in most community colleges.

How faculty accountability is best achieved.

Whether an evaluation form developed at one institution is sufficiently general and yet specific enough for another institution.

Whether an evaluation form developed in one institution can reliably reflect those criteria established in another institution.

How benefical it is for faculty members to participate in the evaluation of their peers.

What role a cooperative administrator-faculty evaluation committee would play in collective bargaining negotiations.

To what extent faculty evaluation improves the quality of instruction.

Whether instructors who evaluate their colleagues tend to be too lenient and not truly objective.

If parallel programs exist that are useful with both part-time and full-time faculty.

Whether the most effective instructors are those with the greatest morale and sense of job satisfaction.

To what extent student grades and faculty ratings are related.

The types and amount of counseling most useful for students in various college programs and with various personal characteristics.

OVERVIEW OF STAFF EVALUATION

Deegan, William L., and Others. Evaluating Community College Personnel: A Research Report. Unpublished paper, 1974. 35pp. (ED 094 847)*

A statewide survey was conducted of local evaluation policies, procedures, and problems of implementing evaluation programs on the campuses of California community colleges. The following areas were studied: (1) the process of development of the evaluation program; (2) procedures utilized in the first year of implementing Senate Bill 696 (evaluation of faculty members); (3) perceptions of the effectiveness of differing evaluation techniques; (4) problems encountered in implementing Senate Bill 696; and (5) recommendation for improving evaluation of certified personnel. Over 700 questionnaires were mailed to all community college presidents, all deans of instruction, all faculty senate presidents, all student body presidents, a random sample of nearly 200 community college faculty, and a sample of local community college trustees. In addition to the questionnaires, the survey team gathered written policies from over 90 community colleges and conducted an analysis of major features of board-adopted evaluation policies. Results of the survey showed that there was decisive consensus among all groups that lack of administrative time and lack of faculty time were the major problems encountered in implementing a faculty evaluation program. Eight recommendations that evolved as a result of the study (three from respondents and five from the survey team) relate to: timing of and feedback from the evaluation process; inservice training; use of evaluation instruments; funding for inservice training; more experimentation; statewide clearinghouse; permanent local committees on the improvement of instruction; and further study.

Delgrosso, George M. (Ed.) Accountability in the Community College: Proceedings of the Annual International Summer Institute (2nd, Ontario, August 19-21, 1971). Ontario, Can.: Lambton College of Applied Arts and Technology; and Port Huron, Mich.: St. Clair County Community College, 1971. 136pp. (ED 060 842)*

The proceedings of this institute, focusing on the opportunities and implications of accountability in community college education, include the eight papers presented as well as the speeches of the four keynote speakers. Several themes and ideas about accountability recur in the papers including the basic questions of "accountability to whom?" and "accountability for what purpose?" Accountability at all levels--local, state and provincial, and national--were discussed, as well as "performance evaluation" of college personnel. The necessity of determining specific learning objectives was mentioned as a method of accountability to students and to the public as well as a method of faculty evaluation. Two speakers described the specific management practices used to improve accountability in their colleges, while two other papers concerned accountability in Canada and England.

Gilley, J. Wade. Evaluation and Motivation of Community College Personnel. Tallahassee, Fla.: Center for State and Regional Leadership; and Gainesville: Florida University, 1972. 38pp. (ED 060 850)*

This report deals with evaluating and motivating community college personnel. Following a discussion of the need for evaluation, a number of evaluation theories and practices are presented: rating systems, predictors of effectiveness, student evaluation, direct measurement, and merit salary increases. The author then describes a theory of motivation and evaluation as a base for his performance evaluation model, which has four stages: a plan, institutional objectives, individual objectives, and actual evaluation. Five recommendations suggested for implementing a statewide plan of institutional evaluation and personnel motivation are: (1) development of institutional objectives; (2) description of the evaluation purpose as product improvement; (3) clarification of instructor responsibilities; (4) individualization of faculty evaluation; and (5) development of long and short range objectives for individual commitment to the institution and evaluation development.

Kinnebrew, Elbert L., and Day, Leo R. Staff Evaluation, Sacramento City College, 1973. Sacramento, Ca.: Sacramento City College, 1973. 31pp. (ED 088 543)*

Efforts of Sacramento City College in performing evaluations of instructors, counselors, and administrative staff or management team are discussed. The district and college philosophy, goals and objectives, standards, and procedural calendar as related to staff evaluation are outlined. Details involved in the treatment of the evaluation data are provided in evaluation forms and data processing references.

McCarter, W. Ronald, and Grigsby, Charles E. Staff Development: A Community College Plan. Whiteville, N.C.: Southeastern Community College, [1976]. 43pp. (ED 129 359--Available in microfiche only)*

This document describes the rationale, development, and implementation of a coordinated college-wide staff development plan at Southeastern Community College. The plan, devised as a result of faculty and staff input, provides for the professional development and evaluation of all college staff: instructional personnel, administrative staff, secretarial and maintenance personnel. Components of the plan for faculty include: evaluation by students, evaluation by supervisor, and evaluation of non-instructional activities (student advisement, committee work). In addition, each faculty member annually submits, after consultation, an Individual Professional Development Plan, specifying short- and long-range goals and means to attain them, and is thereafter evaluated on progress made toward goal completion. Administrative staff and counselors use a similar approach to professional development activity. Secretarial personnel have a Professional Standard Program which involves course work, workshops, work experience,

and testing. Plant maintenance personnel have a system of professional development which includes course work, literature distribution and review, workshops, and evaluation checklists. Part-time faculty are individually oriented and attend teaching skill development workshops. The plan is intended to be flexible and responsive to changing college conditions. Forms used in the evaluation processes are attached.

EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS

Johnston, Archie B. Evaluation of Administrators. Unpublished paper, 1977. 7pp. (ED 136 858)*

This paper briefly reviews the purposes, associated problems, and possible methods of evaluating college administrators. It is noted that there are essentially two possible purposes for administrator evaluation: to increase the efficiency of the college, in which case the emphasis must be placed on the function of the position, or to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the incumbent administrator. It is recommended that evaluations be used to increase efficiency of the college, and secondarily to apprise the individual of his strengths and weaknesses. Some practical suggestions include maintaining an awareness that evaluation will undoubtedly produce tensions, that strict confidentiality must be maintained, and that administrative ratings should be signed by both the rater and the ratee. Use of standarized rating instruments is not suggested since such instruments are generally not able to reflect the unique situations and circumstances of different institutions. It is recommended that each administrator develop a series of short- and long-range objectives and the means by which he plans to reach them. This activity should be performed in cooperation with his immediate superior, who should be his eventual rater. Development of an effective rating system is a time-consuming affair. The ERIC system is recommended as a source of assistance which may provide evaluation developers with ideas adaptable to their situation.

Lewis, Troy. Alvin Community College Administrative and Professional Staff Development Plan. Alvin, Tex.: Alvin Community College, [1978]. 15pp. (ED 148 440)*

The document presents a point-based administrative/professional staff development plan developed by Alvin Community College (Texas). A list of activities and their respective point values are utilized by administrators to document professional growth and development, with a thirty-point minimum per year necessary for advancement to the next vertical step on the administrative/professional salary schedule. Twelve activity areas are outlined for a maximum of sixty points and include: job-related evaluation procedures and criteria; course work and/or teaching assignments; speaking engagements or community events; professional meetings; publications; proposal submission; in-service work shop attendance; commencement ceremony; faculty, administrative/

professional meetings; membership in professional organizations; panel critique of annual performance; and other professional development activities. A rating scale for administrator evaluation is also included.

Los Angeles Community College District Presidential Evaluation Process, 1976-77. Los Angeles: Los Angeles Community College District, 1977. 8pp. (ED 149 805)*

A four-step program for appraising the performance of college presidents in the Los Angeles Community College District is outlined. The steps include: (1) an agreement between the president and the chancellor regarding the content of the president's job and the relative importance of major duties; (2) a definition of the president's goals for each responsibility along with a timetable for their attainment; (3) an agreement between the chancellor and the president on check points for the evaluation of the president's progress and means by which to measure it; and (4) a review by the chancellor and the president of the president's efforts to meet previously established goals. A list of six positive advantages this proposed program entails, and seven recommendations for further appraisal are included. Standards for satisfactory presidential performance are outlined in eleven areas: planning, organization, development or recruitment of administrative personnel, policy formation, establishment of performance standards and review for administrative staff, morale, fiscal control, educational program supervision, community relations, relationship with the chancellor, and presidential self-development. An administrative effectiveness appraisal rating scale completes the document.

Losak, John. The Myth of Rational Evaluation. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Seattle, Wash., April 13-16, 1975. 12pp. (ED 112 993)*

A management by objectives approach to evaluation develops performance objectives as a means of minimizing the bias related to individual judgment. This paper focuses on three variables which contribute to the presence of subjectivity in performance evaluation. The first of these is psychological and includes such factors as judgment, power relationships, and the influence of rumor. If "getting along with others," a category which can only be judged subjectively, is omitted as a performance objective, assessment is neglected on the criterion most often at the heart of dismissal. Judgment also enters the evaluation process when performance objectives are being set, and when assessing how well the administrator has achieved his objectives. The second variable which contributes to subjectivity is the atmosphere of the college. Socioeconomic and political variables must provide adequate time for the long and demanding evaluation process, and the atmosphere of the college must favor those who participate. Third, factors external to the college, e.g., laws which mandate achievement of balance in

ethnic or sex categories, and supply and demand of administrators play a subtle, but significant, role in reducing objectivity.

Pollack, J. David. The Development and Testing of a Criterion Referenced Evaluation System for Faculty and Administrators in Technical/ Community Colleges. Final Report. Raleigh: North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, 1976. 169pp. (ED 133 578)*

In order to develop teacher and administrator evaluation systems based on specific measurable criteria, a research population of three groups (full-time students, teachers, and administrators) was drawn from the 57 North Carolina technical institutes and community colleges. Random samples selected from 16 institutions were surveyed, with findings based on responses from 181 students, 150 teachers, and 92 administrators. From field testing of the evaluation instruments at six institutions it was concluded that the evaluation criteria developed were valid. Survey results indicated that generally attitudes of all three groups toward evaluation were not favorable. Teachers held the lowest attitude while administrator attitude was the most favorable. It was felt that the low level of attitude was due to the evaluation systems currently in use. Each group felt that evaluation of a teacher's or an administrator's effectiveness should be based on a combination of information sources. Teachers and administrators agreed on how often evaluation should be conducted and that the time should be determined by the institution. They also responded positively to all the criteria listed for both groups and were fairly close in their rankings of both sets of criteria. Included in the report are literature reviews on both teacher and administrator evaluation and the teacher and administrator evaluation forms developed. Detailed responses are presented in narrative and tabular form. Appended are the 11 evaluation forms used in the study including the survey instrument, teacher and administrator opinionnaire, student evaluation forms, teacher and administrator self-evaluation forms, and evaluation forms for chairman, peer, and staff.

Williams, Ruthann E. Presidential Evaluation. Unpublished paper, [1977]. 32pp. (ED 144 643)*

The interest in and need for presidential evaluation has arisen from the increased size and complexity of institutions, the call for accountability, the increasing difficulty of the presidential task, and the shift in roles and responsibilities of the presidency. Presidential evaluation provides an institution with the opportunity to delineate carefully the roles, responsibilities, and expectations for its chief executive officer, and allows the president to clarify his/her own goals. Criteria for evaluation should include the areas of leadership, academic planning and internal administration, decision-making and problem-solving, institutional representation, and personal qualities. Possible evaluation methods include the use of an internal or external

"fact-finder," ad-hoc committees, self-assessment, or an internal feedback system. Rating scales, developed from agreed upon criteria, should be used. The president's self-assessment can use the same scales, or can take a narrative form which includes his goals, administrative style, major issues confronting the institution, and strategies for goal achievement. A bibliography is appended.

FACULTY EVALUATION

Allison, Robert, and Others. An Assessment of Two Years of Faculty Evaluation. Bakersfield, Ca.: Bakersfield College, 1975. 37pp. (ED 101 814)*

A survey instrument was designed to ascertain faculty opinion on the faculty evaluation process so that the Academic Senate could make recommendations for future changes. Under the present system faculty must be evaluated every two years, but, within certain guidelines, departmental procedures may vary. A total of 77.3 percent of all faculty and administrators responded. Analysis of the data revealed the following: (1) the purpose of evaluation for regular (tenured) staff should be for the improvement of instruction; for contract (nontenured) staff the question of retention or dismissal should also be considered (present procedures treat regular and contract staff equally); (2) most faculty find evaluation moderately effective and beneficial and not threatening; (3) many faculty members seem to spend more time and receive more benefits from participating in the evaluation of others than themselves; (4) most faculty feel that the department chairman should be actively involved in evaluation; (5) a large number of faculty did not receive copies of their evaluations, although they should have; (6) over 85 percent of the respondents did not think that Bakersfield College should "try to do a complete and effective evaluation job, substantially exceeding legal requirements"; and (7) over 80 percent want to continue the present plan with minor modifications. The questionnaire, cover letters, tabulated responses, and additional faculty comments are presented.

Catania, James C. Faculty Evaluation Within Collective Bargaining Constraints. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Denver, Colo., April 17-20, 1977. 34pp. (ED 142 251)*

The author urges administrators to be prepared for collective bargaining by recognizing the importance of teacher evaluation to the process. Citing as a bargaining error the agreement to form a cooperative administrative-faculty committee to develop a system for evaluating faculty at Waukesha County Technical Institute (Wisconsin), he then presents the resultant successful outline of assumptions and the faculty evaluation system. The system provides mandatory evaluation by the teacher's

immediate supervisor, by the teacher, and by students. Optional evaluation is suggested by a peer and a management member other than the immediate supervisor. System components include (1) an initial conference, (2) a teaching observation, (3) an assessment conference, and (4) an action plan. Criteria for evaluation are operationally stated as behavioral objectives for the instructor. A college document entitled "WCTI Faculty Evaluation System" is appended, which provides a rationale, criteria, procedures for each type of evaluation, and evaluation forms.

Cohen, Arthur M., and Brawer, Florence B. Measuring Faculty Performance. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges; and Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1969. 90pp. (ED 031 222)*

This report focuses on the techniques, objectives, and problems associated with teacher and teaching evaluation. The first section of this 2-part monograph was devoted to the discussion and appraisal of methods currently employed. Topics considered included: a review of the standard techniques of supervisor, colleague, student, and self evaluation; a discussion of the problems inherent in these methods such as rater bias, ambiguity of purpose, and lack of definite criteria; an overview of research attempting to relate teacher personality with teacher effectiveness; and an outline of a program incorporated into the junior college teacher preparation program at UCLA that aimed at predicting the success of new teachers by the use of various personality dimensions. A case for changing the purposes, methods, and criteria of faculty assessment was presented in part two. It was suggested that faculty evaluation, as a tool to improve instruction, must relate to instruction as a discipline with the focus placed on the effects of instruction, an approach that may result in the development of team teaching techniques and evaluation among instructors on the basis of teaching effectiveness alone. The problems in specifying criteria for assessing teacher effectiveness, a rational for using student achievement of learning objectives as the main criteria of teacher effect, suggested designs for assessing instructors, and a scheme for supervising instruction were presented.

Cohen, Arthur M., and Brawer, Florence B. The Who What, Why of Instructor Evaluation. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1972. 19pp. (ED 060 839)*

A self-report system for individual community college instructors to use in evaluating their own professional performance is advanced as a tentative means to respond to California teacher evaluation bill SB 696. Four instructor activity areas are suggested as appropriate for evaluation: (1) instruction, requiring the use of specific measurable objectives; (2) service to the college, including committee work, club work, and other institutional activities; (3) service to the community; and (4) professional expertise, including those elements increasing an

instructor's knowledge of his field. The primary aspect of the self-evaluation process consists of a faculty interviewing committee to question instructors about each of the above named areas. Instructors will present to the committee teaching objectives, test scores, student rating forms, and a resume of school, community, and professional activities. A yearly file on each instructor, developed from the interviews, would be reviewed at each evaluation meeting. This self-report system differs from ordinary self-report and introspective methods in that it relies on concept measurement, is open to peers for process evaluation, and focuses on instructor intentions and results.

The Evaluation of Community College Teaching: Models in Theory and Practice. Sacramento: California Junior College Association, 1972. 100pp. (ED 063 923)*

This report presents the proceedings of the Conference on Models for the Evaluation of Teaching. The papers included are: (1) Teachers and Their Evaluation; (2) A Performance-Centered Model for the Evaluation of Teaching; (3) A Learner-Centered Model; (4) Evaluation as a Change Mechanism--A Management Model; (5) Faculty Roles in Evaluation; (6) The Role of the Administration in the Evaluation of Teaching; (7) The Trustee Role in the Evaluation of Teaching; (8) The Trustee--and Teacher Evaluation in California Community Colleges; and (9) The Student Role in Evaluation of Community College Teaching--A Proposal for Balance and Fairness. The appendices contain sample teacher evaluation forms, a faculty development model, and a selected bibliography.

Menard, Joseph W. Developing an Instrument for Evaluating Faculty by Students, Colleagues, and Administrators at Rhode Island Junior College. Unpublished paper, 1975. 55pp. (ED 112 961)*

This study was undertaken to devise a standardized faculty evaluation instrument which could be used by all departments at Rhode Island Junior College and which could be easily filled out by students, colleagues, and the department chairpersons of the instructor being evaluated. In order to ascertain the preferences of the college community regarding items which should be incorporated into such an instrument, two attitudinal questionnaires were designed and administered to 70 faculty members and a random sample of 200 students. One of the questionnaires related to preferred instrument format; the other to the characteristics essential to effective faculty performance. Among five alternative formats for the evaluation instrument, those polled preferred a multiple choice format. The selected characteristics of effective instructors closely paralleled the characteristics cited in the literature of the field. The developed instrument (which contains 50 items, with separate sections for students, advisees, faculty, and division chairpersons) is presented, as are both preliminary questionnaires and tables displaying questionnaire results. Pilot testing, revision, and college-wide implementation of the instrument are recommended.

Menzie, John Carroll. An Analysis of the Process of Teacher Evaluation in the Community College. Doctoral dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1973. (Available from University Microfilms, 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Mich., 48106, Order No. 73-23,399.)

An analysis of teacher evaluation as practiced during 1971-1972 and 1972-1973 in community colleges throughout the United States is presented. To identify the concepts and outcomes of teacher evaluation a survey was made of current literature, two questionnaires were sent to 226 community colleges, and 67 interviews were conducted. There are essentially three methods used to evaluate teachers in community colleges: determining teacher characteristics, assessing teacher performance, and measuring student outcomes. The principal claims made for evaluation are that it: (1) improves instruction, (2) provides information for decisions on retention and dismissal, (3) is a threat to academic freedom, (4) affects faculty morale, and (5) would eliminate incompetent teachers from the college staff. The findings from the questionnaires showed that about three-fourths of all community colleges in the nation had a formal evaluation program. Findings from the interviews are given.

Preliminary Report of the Faculty Professional Growth Committee. St. Louis, Mo.: St. Louis Junior College District, 1974. 49pp. (ED 116 738)*

As a guide to its deliberations, the Faculty Professional Growth Committee of the St. Louis Junior College District prepared and distributed to all members of the professional teaching staff a questionnaire covering what should be included in faculty evaluations, how much weight should be given to each item, and whether teaching effectiveness could best be measured by performance or outcome. Approximately 300 faculty members responded, giving heaviest weight to classroom effectiveness, however measured; least weight to personal life style; and preference to performance over outcome as a means of measuring teaching effectiveness. With the help of the responses to the questionnaire, the committee produced this report which recommends that evaluations for faculty growth be kept separate from evaluations for promotion and retention, and makes some suggestions for ways of promoting growth. The report also specifies what should be considered in promotional evaluations, and the relative weight each item should be given. This report, accordingly, is divided into two parts, with part 1 addressed to growth and development, and part 2 addressed to criteria for promotional evaluation. The questionnaire and tabulated responses are appended.

A Report to the Commission on Instruction of the American Association of Junior Colleges. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970. 20pp. (ED 038 974)*

The development of a rationale and of a tentative set of guidelines for evaluating community junior college instruction is the

range of purposes for which instructor evaluation might be undertaken, including promotion, tenure, and improvement of instruction. The choice of evaluators is then discussed, and students, academic administrators, and colleagues are considered. Next, student and instructor performance are investigated as criteria for evaluation. Finally, methods and techniques of evaluation are covered, with emphasis on the potential of electronic recording systems. Concluding the report are appendices outlining evaluation procedures, purposes, and guidelines; sample instructor evaluation criteria; and tables of current evaluation factors in use and their frequency of employment.

Foss, Donald M., and Brown, Jennings G. Cost of Evaluating Faculty Performance at Antelope Valley Community College for the 1972-1973 School Year. Lancaster, Ca.: Antelope Valley College, 1973. 5pp. (ED 076 187)*

The costs incurred at Antelope Valley Community College (California) in evaluating the performance of college faculty members for the 1972-73 school year are summarized. Evaluation fell into two phases--implementation and operation. Implementation involved the issuance of written procedures, necessary forms, the purchase of equipment and supplies, and an initial series of meetings between the administrative staff and faculty. Cost summaries are divided into the two phases, showing two workload conditions. One assumes that manpower had to be paid as ar extra charge to the district, and the other restricts manpower costs to new "in-hires" only. Persons evaluated totaled 105 and were divided into three groups--instructors, administration, and nonteaching certificated personnel.

Schneider, Lester S. Faculty Opinion of the Spring 1974 Peer Evaluation. Los Angeles: Los Angeles City College, 1975. 24pp. (ED 104 493)*

In order to appraise the value of teacher peer evaluation as practiced at Los Angeles City College, a questionnaire was sent to 300 counselors, administrators, and tenured faculty. Eighty-four questionnaires were returned. The major finding was that the present system was ineffective in that the teaching characteristics of those evaluated did not change and in that it did not improve the quality of instruction. Teachers and counselors agreed that when teachers evaluate one another, they tend to be lenient and not truly honest. All three groups agreed that teacher evaluation is necessary, but that some other method should be employed. Administrators believed that student evaluation of teachers is much more honest and meaningful than is peer evaluation. Teachers and counselors felt that administrators should also be evaluated. According to the author: (1) the evaluation form now used by the district should be discarded and a new form should be devised which allows a greater variety of choices (not just "Competent" and "Needs to Improve"); (2) district subsidized inservice training for all faculty should be required every three or four years; (3) teacher evaluation should be conducted by students, administrators, outside specialists,

and department chairmen, as well as by peers; and (4) the evaluation process should be based on student achievement of learning objectives, and should include means by which to improve teaching quality.

Tolle, Donald J. Evaluation: Who Needs It? Paper presented at a faculty workshop held at Mineral Area College, Flat River, Mo., September 3, 1970. 15pp. (ED 059 716)*

This is a review of the literature surrounding the development of techniques for, and changes in professional attitudes toward, the evaluation of community college faculty in their instructional role. Discussion focuses on the purpose, criteria, and process of evaluation. In discussing the purposes of evaluation, the author deals with teacher rating systems, philosophical conflicts between evaluation purposes and methods, and educational services' accountability and quality. The evaluation criteria discussion pinpoints attributes, abilities, and competencies that contribute to good teaching. Several lists of criteria are given as possible guidelines. The evaluation process is considered in the light of who is to do it and by what means. Several series of outlined procedures are given for instituting an evaluation process.

EVALUATION OF PART-TIME FACULTY

Fellows, David B. An Evaluation Plan for Part-Time Faculty in Community/Junior Colleges. Unpublished paper, 1975. 164pp. (ED 133 009)*

A study was conducted to develop and test an evaluation plan for part-time continuing education faculty at St. Petersburg Junior College. Components of the plan included development of a self-instructional booklet on concepts of adult education and use of the booklet by part-time faculty prior to their teaching assignment, self-evaluation by faculty after completing their teaching assignment, and personal coaching sessions with administrators to identify needs and strategies for improvement. Evaluation of the plan indicated significant growth in professional understanding on the part of the participating faculty. In addition, as a result of the coaching sessions part-time faculty professional growth needs were rank ordered by the administrators, and 124 strategies for improvement were identified. A cost index of the coaching sessions was also compiled. The self-instructional booklet, faculty self-evaluation forms, and a list of improvement strategies are included among the appendices.

Hammons, Jim; Wallace, Terry H. Smith; and Watts, Gordon. Staff Development in the Community College: A Handbook. Topical Paper No. 66. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, June 1978. 95pp. (ED number yet to be assigned)*

Because the concept of staff development has generated considerable interest in community colleges nationwide, and many educators are engaged in its implementation, this handbook was prepared as a comprehensive survey of essential topics in planning, implementing, and evaluating staff development programs. The handbook, focusing on in-service education, is divided into six chapters and four appendices. Chapter 1 deals with definitions, purposes, and rationale of staff development; Chapter 2 reviews some of the more persistent questions raised about planning and implementing a program for full-time staff; and Chapter 3 describes various means to determine staff needs. In Chapter 4, the unique needs of part-time faculty are delineated, while Chapter 5 discusses program evaluation. Chapter 6 represents views on key elements essential to effective programs. Appendix A includes a useful format for a staff development questionnaire; Appendices B and C illustrate different needs survey instruments and interview questions; and Appendix D lists possible topics to be included in a needs assessment query. A practitioner's bibliography and a list of references follow the appendices.

Heinberg, Sylvester. Procedures for the Supervision and Evaluation of New Part-Time Evening-Division Instructors in California Junior Colleges. Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1966. (Available from University Microfilms, 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Mich., Order No. 67-405.)

This study was designed to determine (1) who is responsible for the improvement of the part-time instructional staff in evening programs, (2) how the staff is and should be supervised and evaluated, (3) how to develop recommended practices for evaluation and improvement. Administrators from 63 California junior colleges reported current practices in finding, screening, and hiring such instructors. Fourteen of the most experienced administrators were selected as a separate validating group, the others as a second respondent group. Practices used by 70 percent of the select group are considered "recommended." Practices in developing teaching assignments and in locating, screening, and the responses of both groups are given by number and percentage. Orientation practices for newly appointed instructors and supervision and evaluation methods for all the part-time evening teachers are similarly reported by group. A combined list of all 47 practices most highly recommended by the select group is presented. The study concludes with a summary of the general findings, conclusions, and recommendations, and with suggestions for further research.

STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY

Bers, Trudy. An Analysis of the Student Evaluation Form at Oakton Community College. Unpublished paper, 1977. 28pp. (ED 140 877)*

This paper reports the results of an evaluative statistical analysis of the instrument employed for student evaluation of faculty at Oakton Community College (Illinois). The analysis was performed because the locally devised instrument had never been subjected to systematic study of reliability or validity, and because a review of pertinent literature indicated a lack of consensus on what types of variables affect students' evaluations of faculty. Results suggested that the instrument failed to discriminate clearly between positive and negative aspects of course organization, faculty performance, classroom ambience, and other evaluation variables; that the positive wording used in constructing the instrument was such that faulty data might result from inculcation of a response set; and that equal weighting was given to each item on the evaluation form, even though each item was not necessarily applicable to each instructor or class. It was recommended that Oakton define and clarify the purposes of faculty evaluation, review existing instruments in use at other institutions, select or design an instrument meeting the purposes, and pretest the chosen instrument for reliability and validity before implementation. A review of the literature, tabular data from the instrument analysis, a bibliography, and the evaluation instrument are included.

Calistra, Donald J. A Reassessment of College Students' Instructional Expectations and Evaluations. Unpublished paper, 1972. 30pp. (ED 067 092)*

This paper explores two aspects of student evaluations of college teaching: (1) a reformulation of end-of-term ratings, by defining them in relation to initial student expectations; and (2) it presents a research design which studies this reformulation in the natural setting of the classroom. An expectations instrument, using semantic differential scales, was administered at the beginning and end of a semester to 209 social science students at three colleges. Some findings were: (1) there were statistically significant differences between expectations and evaluations, even for those classes where the actual evaluations were quite high; (2) freshmen and sophomores at all three colleges exhibited similar expectations; (3) sophomores, rather than freshmen, consistently revealed higher evaluations; and (4) compared with sophomores, freshmen expectations appeared more in keeping with their evaluations. It was concluded that an end-of-course rating can be a generally reliable indicator of student reaction, but an accurate appraisal of the dynamics of the teaching-learning situation requires input of teacher and student expectations.

Cooper, John F. The Morale and Teaching Effectiveness of Junior College Teachers. Unpublished paper, [1977]. 13pp. (ED 134 266)*

Following a review of the literature related to employee morale and productivity, this paper reports a study undertaken to determine if there was a significant relationship between the morale of junior college instructors and their teaching effectiveness as perceived by students. Study subjects were 129 junior college instructors and their students enrolled in college transfer programs. A modified version of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire was used to identify teacher morale variables. Teaching effectiveness as perceived by students was determined using the Hinds (Mississippi) Junior College Faculty Evaluation Scale. A statistically significant relationship was found for the measures of satisfaction with teaching, community support of education, and total job satisfaction with the teaching effectiveness rating by students. It was concluded that instructors' perception of satisfaction with teaching was positively related to their teaching effectiveness, instructors' perception of community support of education had a negative relationship to teaching effectiveness, and total job satisfaction was positively related to teaching effectiveness. Other identified measures of teacher morale were not significant predictors of teaching effectiveness. These results may indicate that the most effective teachers are those with the greatest morale and job satisfaction. A bibliography is appended.

Haywood, Elsie D. Designing a Student Evaluation of Team Teaching Effectiveness and a Procedure for Its Administration. Unpublished paper, 1975. 25pp. (ED 113 006)*

A "student evaluation of instruction" survey instrument applicable to team teaching was designed and administered to a pilot group of 27 students enrolled in Alvin Junior College (Texas) nursing courses during the 1974-75 academic year. Statements on the survey form were divided into three segments: those dealing with team preparation for teaching; those dealing with implementation of teaching or what the teaching did for the student; and those for student comments dealing with what was done well in the course and what should be done to improve the course. Responses were analyzed by number and percentage in each of five rating columns: outstanding, superior, competent, fair, and less than fair. Results indicated that the form was applicable to the teaching approach, and that the data generated could be useful in facilitating learning and teaching in other nursing courses using team teaching. A survey of the literature is included, and data is organized into tables and graphs.

Nelson, Dennis E. Formulating Instrumentation for Student Assessment of Systematic Instruction. Texas City, Tex.: College of the Mainland, 1976. 34pp. (ED 124 243)*

A review of the literature indicates the recent popularity of student evaluation of faculty in (1) providing feedback to faculty so that they can modify or improve their instruction; (2) acquiring information to be used in evaluating faculty, and in making tenure and promotion decisions; (3) acquiring information to be disseminated to students so that they can make course and curriculum choices. In spite of the high number of evaluation instruments produced in recent years, few have specifically been geared to the theoretical model of instruction being applied in the course to be evaluated. In order to alleviate this problem, a new student evaluation instrument--The Student Assessment of Systematic Instruction (SASI) is being developed at College of the Mainland. The proposed instrument divides the evaluation into six categories; the organization and structure of learning, the quality of learning materials, students' perception of the value of course content, students' perception of their own personal growth, quality of teaching, and quality of student-teacher interaction. Students are asked to rate the section in which they are enrolled in relation to other sections in the same course, department, division, and college; and to explain what reasons they have for their rating. Results will be reported by computer, and a sample computer printout is appended.

Powell, Robert. Grading Style and Student Evaluation of Faculty. Palatine, Ill.: William Rainey Harper College, 1975. 37pp. (ED 118 165)*

This paper discusses the association between student grades and student ratings of faculty. The first section reviews a 1974 study of Harper College English teacher ratings, which showed a correlation of .73 between the grades the teachers gave students and the ratings students gave the teachers. The second section reports the findings of a 1975 replication study which showed grade-rating correlations of up to .79. The third section provides a review of the literature in the form of an annotated bibliography, indicating that the Harper findings are typical of the findings of prior research at other colleges. Twenty-eight studies involving more than 70,000 student ratings of faculty in more than 50 colleges and universities have been conducted and published since 1954. In every study, at least some association has been found between grades and ratings, and in a number of the studies, the association has been found to be quite powerful, with correlations ranging up to .90. The fourth section of this document discusses the implications of the findings, concluding that the widely-held belief that grades and ratings are unrelated is a myth, relying for its support on studies conducted more than 20 years ago--studies that are weak in design and execution, and sometimes less than candid in reporting the data.

Vandervert, Larry R. Student Evaluation of Instruction: Some Theoretical Considerations and a Proposal. Paper presented at Meeting of the Washington State Community College, District 17 Board of Trustees, March 1974. 9pp. (ED 093 394)*

A theoretical model is presented of student needs-to-be-satisfied that is designed to meet three interrelated criteria: (1) that the needs be related to the goals or objectives of instructors and the institutions which employ them, (2) that the satisfaction of the needs be objectively measurable on the instructor, and (3) that the needs be theoretically defendable in relation to needs college students in the classroom actually have.

EVALUATION OF NON-INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL

Hecht, Alfred R., and Henry, Bonnie. Development of a Semantic Differential Instrument for Student Evaluation of Community College Counseling Conferences. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the North Central Region AERA Special Interest Group on Community/Junior College Research, Madison, Wis., July 15-16, 1976. 29pp. (ED 125 679)*

In the past, annual student evaluation of counselor effectiveness of Moraine Valley Community College (Illinois) has been conducted by means of three unvalidated instruments. In order to achieve increased accountability, a student services committee has developed a conceptual design for a comprehensive counselor effectiveness evaluation system. As a component of the larger system, a valid and reliable diagnostic instrument was developed for student evaluation of individual counseling services. This instrument was designed with a semantic differential scale to measure the effectiveness of three different counseling processes (acceptance of client, counselor self-acceptance, counselor support), and two counseling outcomes (conference worthwhileness, client independence). A jury of counselors, counselor educators, and counselor administrators confirmed the content and construct validity of the instrument. Construct validity was also demonstrated by means of a principal components analysis of 281 student evaluations of 11 counselors. Internal consistency reliability coefficients confirmed the multidimensionality of the instrument. A survey of the literature on counselor evaluation is presented, as are complete statistical results of the jury evaluation and preliminary application of the instrument. The instrument itself is appended.

A Report of the Satisfaction of Recent Vocational-Technical Graduates with the Academic Counseling and Registration Assistance Received. Honolulu, Hi.: Leeward Community College, 1975. 24pp. (ED 119 779)*

In fall 1974, 126 students who had been enrolled in vocational-technical programs at Leeward Community College during the 1973-74 academic year, and who had petitioned for graduation, were sent follow-up surveys. This report details their reactions to academic counseling and registration assistance. The 96 responses represent a 76 percent response rate. Seventy of the respondents had received the associate degree, and 26 had received a certificate. The vocational areas that were most heavily represented were secretarial science and accounting. About 20 percent of the students felt that they did not need counseling, but over 40 percent reported that they could have benefited from additional counseling. Most of the respondents were not veterans, but those who were felt that the veterans' counseling program was either good or bad improved subsequent to their graduation. About 13 percent of all respondents felt that the quality of academic counseling was excellent, and 30 percent rated it as good. However, about 10 percent of the respondents said it was poor. Most of the students felt that the college was meeting their registration assistance needs, but many noted a need for more vocational offerings in the evening. Data are tabulated, and the survey instrument is appended, along with comments of the respondents.

Wesolowski, Zdzislaw P. A Humanistic Approach to Evaluation of Community College Non-Instructional Personnel. Unpublished paper, 1974. 35pp. (ED 099 074)*

To fulfill the need to develop a system of performance evaluation of non-instructional personnel which would serve as a guide for personnel development as well as a measure of performance, an evaluation systems model was constructed. This project necessitated a study of the existing non-instructional personnel evaluation systems at all 4- and 2-year colleges in Florida which revealed that no two institutions followed a similar policy of evaluation. The proposed model is a composite of the reported procedures and depends upon 10 rating factors: quantity and quality of work, knowledge of the job, initiative, aptitude and ability to learn, attention to duty, dependability, judgement, cooperation, and personality and attitude. It is intended to establish norms for performance which could be utilized in all Florida community colleges. The document includes a sample evaluation form and a guide for supervisors for the evaluation of performance.

Whitehead, Everett. The Counselor as a Social Force: Identifying Counselor Role and Functions in the Community College. Unpublished paper, 1974. 106pp. (ED 105 917--Available in microfiche only.)*

School counselors face identity crises since they must respond to the conflicting demands of students, faculty members, administrators, commercial and industrial interests, parents, and the local community. In order to defend themselves against public criticism, counselors must find a way of illustrating their effectiveness. Data obtained from an administration of the IRC Input-Output Analysis of Student Personnel Services (1971-73) was used to determine the performance (objectives, efforts, and outputs) of all Florida community college counselors and of Brevard Community College (BCC) counselors. The major conclusions drawn are: (1) counselors are an effective social force in educational institutions and will remain so as long as their services facilitate the goals of the institution; (2) counselors do have an identity problem; (3) a systems approach to the management of counselor activities can be an effective tool in defining and evaluating the role and effectiveness of community college counselors; and (4) counseling is functioning at a healthy and satisfactory level in Flordia community colleges and at BCC. The author recommends the adoption of a systems model by BCC counselors; such a model will determine the results of exact services provided and will measure the benefits in relation to cost to the institution. A review of pertinent literature and several tables and charts illustrating data are also included.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

SEP 2 9 1978

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES